THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VIII. FEBRUARY, 1928. No. 2.

The Work of Christ.

Translated from Dr. Ed. Preuss's *Die Rechtfertigung des Suenders vor Gott.* Part I, of which the first chapter is offered here, is superscribed "On Redemption."

The REV. JUL. A. FRIEDRICH, Iowa City, Iowa.

The bars of our prison are broken, its gates are shattered. What we could not do another one has done: Jesus Christ, true man and true God. The offense of one man brought condemnation; the righteousness of one Man brings rescue. Rom. 5, 18. True, not the righteousness of a *mere* man, for a *mere* man would have died for his own sins and could not have reconciled the Lord of the earth, just as little as a pot its potter. What gave that insuperable power to the righteousness of this Jesus was the fact that He is the true God and eternal Life. 1 John 5, 20.

This Son of David, who at the same time is the Son of God, Jer. 23, 5. 6, bore our sin. Isaiah prophesies this three times: "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all," Is. 53, 6; "He shall bear their iniquities," Is. 53, 11; "He bare the sins of many," Is. 53, 11. John the Baptist testifies to this when he says: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." John 1, 29. If I am groaning under a heavy load and another man comes and takes it on his shoulders, then he takes my place. We were groaning under the load of our sins; then Christ came and took them on His shoulders. Therefore we justly say that He took our place. How earnestly this substitution was meant is shown 1 Pet. 2, 24: He "His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree," that is, on the cross. And there is where they belonged. It is one thing to wear another man's uniform in times of peace and quite another thing to wear it in a battle. He who wears it in a battle is willing and ready to do service in another man's place. But more: Scripture not only teaches that Christ bore our sins, but it directly calls Him, the true God, "sin." 2 Cor. 5, 21. If God made Him to be sin, then He was *sin* indeed. How are we to understand

and the wrath of God in our stead, even so did He suffer death in our place. For sin worketh wrath, and wrath worketh death. After Caiaphas had heard the charges of the Pharisees against Jesus, he judged: "It is expedient for us that one should die for the people and that the whole people perish not. And this spake he not of himself, but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die *for* that nation." John 11, 50. 51. True, "for" in this text means *"for the benefit* of the people," but for the benefit of the people through becoming their Substitute. For if I die in order that my brother need not die, *who otherwise would have had to die,* then I die in his stead. In the light of this testimony we now understand 1 Pet. 3, 18: "Christ hath once suffered for sin, the Just for the unjust," and Rom. 5, 6. 7: "Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet, peradventure, for a good man some would even dare to die." Thus He satisfied divine justice for us; for He tasted the first and the second death and drank the cup of the wrath of God to the dregs. Our redemption could not be purchased with a smaller price than that. The fact that the Son of God in Gethsemane thrice asked His Father in vain to let the cup of death pass from him proves that this was not possible, otherwise it would have been done. Christ had to suffer these things. Luke 24, 26; Acts 17, 3.

But Christ satisfied the holy will of God not only by His *passive,* but also by His *active* obedience; not only by suffering, but also by doing. Made of a woman, He was made under the Law, Gal. 4, 4, and fulfilled it perfectly, Matt. 5, 17, from His being subject to His parents, Luke 2, 51, to the washing of His disciples' feet, John 13, 4. 5. All His doing, suffering, and dying was done in obedience to God the Father and was to be a vicarious fulfilling of the Law. And this obedience flowed from love.

Verily, "Christ hath loved us and hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor." Eph. 5, 2. For the sake of His love toward us He, according to the will of God, gave His blood for us: His flesh for our flesh, His soul for ours. Especially the Epistle to the Hebrews places the sin-offering of Christ under this viewpoint of self-sacrifice, an act of perfect obedience, by saying: "Christ, through the eternal Spirit, offered Himself without spot to God." Heb. 7, 27; 9, 14. No man was able to take His life from Him, but He laid it down of Himself. John 10, 18. Everything He did, from His incarnation until His death, was done in obedience to God the Father. Phil. 2, 8.

And at last, when Christ had done and suffered sufficiently,

"He said, It is finished; and He bowed His head and gave up the ghost." John 19, 30. But "He was taken from prison and from judgment." Is. 53, 8. As God declared Him to be guilty of the sins of the world when, on the cross, He numbered Him with the transgressors, Is. 53, 12; Luke 22, 37; 23, 32. 33, so He publicly freed Him, justified Him from all sin, when He raised Him up from the dead. That is what St. Paul means when he says that Christ "was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit." 1 Tim. 3, 16.

This is the work of Christ. And what are its blessings?

(The second chapter will appear in the next number.)

The Lutherans at Lausanne.

(Concluded.)

The Unity of Christendom and the Relation Thereto of Existing Churches.

(Report of Section VII.)

This report, prepared chiefly by Archbishop Soederblom and the archbishop of Armagh and reviewed by Bishop Brent, the bishop of Gloucester, and Canon Tatlow, was referred to the Continuation Committee for amendment. It need not be given here in full. The following quotations (translated from the *Kirchenzeitung*) characterize it: "Christian unity finds its expression in love, in faith, and in order. . . . In obedience to the Master's commandment of love there should be community of work by all Christians, as being one body and one visible communion of brethren, without prejudice to their theological principles. . . . The union movement which found its expression at Lausanne has a Church in view which is united in the essentials of faith and order, but takes in different types of dogma and of the execution of the ecclesiastical office. . . . In a united Church there must be 1) a common faith, a common message to the world; 2) Baptism as the rite of incorporation into the one Church; 3) the Holy Communion as expressing the community of the Church; 4) a ministry everywhere recognized in the whole Church; 5) liberty regarding the conception of the Sacraments, the ministerial order, and the ecclesiastical authority (regarding the measure of this liberty there is a difference of opinions); 6) due provision for the exercise of the prophetic spirit. . . . Ways of approach. . . . We also emphasize the value of joint evangelistic work."

The story of this report is thus told by the *Watchman-Examiner:* "The report was sharply criticized by American High-church Episcopalians and received only for reference to the Continuation Committee. The rule of the Conference requiring that all actions must be unanimous or at least *nemine contradicente,* prevented the reception of this report with the others, although it is safe to say that a large majority favored it. The progressive element was outspoken in its regret that it was not received. It contained a plan for a league of churches for practical purposes, in which many saw the possibility of an international federation which might prove powerful for world peace. It gave definite suggestions for working together, praised the growing unity on the mission-field, and advocated that 'all God's children should join in communion at the Lord's Table.' The ancient conflict between the priest and the prophet asserted itself at this point, so that this document could not be received."

The High-church Episcopalians, however, were not the only ones who refused to enter the projected union. There were others who protested, for other reasons. The *Lutheran* brings this out: "The Conference on Faith and Order has adjourned in non-agreement. Thus the secular press makes announcement. The actual break, if one can call a break what was not together, is laid at the door of the delegates of the Eastern Orthodox Church. They announced themselves as willing to accept the plenary authority of Holy Scripture, but beyond this they would subscribe to nothing later than the decrees of the ecumenical councils. Bishop Brent is reported to have observed that the Eastern Orthodox and the Lutherans had come out in direct negatives against any proposals for union that were offered. This is really another way of stating that the Anglican group is not yet ready to subordinate its own theory of the ministry in the process of 'reuniting Christendom.'" We are glad to note that Bishop Brent found occasion for criticizing and condemning the stand the Lutherans took at Lausanne. It is to their credit that they had a share in blocking the plans of the extreme unionists. More's the pity that they did not consistently and fully maintain the Lutheran position. The discussion of the Lausanne affair calls for a chapter on

Unionism.

The World Conference was conceived by the unionistic spirit, and the conference at Lausanne ran true to form. It was ruled by the desire to establish a union without unity. The group which

"seemed willing to disregard all existing confessions of faith and to merge all existent denominational organizations into one" (Sherer's interview) constituted the majority of the conference, a majority which did not at all approve of the declaration of the Eastern Orthodox bishops, who "refused to participate even in these statements, lest they be thought to agree to a mere verbal unity, without any true union underneath" (*America*), but was ready to accept even the raw unionistic proposals offered by Section VII. Dr. Ainslie, a representative man of this group, deplores the fact that these divergent elements did not unite in a common celebration of the Lord's Supper. "It would have been a still greater victory if the conference could have closed with it. And the fact that it could not be done left an ugly picture." The conference did not reach that ultimate point, but went very far on the road of unionism. The *Federal Council Bulletin* reports that "the conference itself has made a notable beginning in the fact that it has contributed to a sense of oneness despite differences." It gives that as "the judgment of those who attended it." The men interviewed by the *Bulletin* were impressed by the prevalence of the unionistic spirit. Dr. Soper brings the same report: "No one seems to feel for a moment that any one is expected to surrender a conviction." So the Protestant group felt, according to the correspondent of the *Living Church,* who points out, says *America,* "that, while he and his devoted associates [the Anglo-Catholics] were striving for a visible organic unity, the only thing the Protestants could conceive is a federal unity, that is, one in which every variety of faith would be represented, even the most opposed, but united by some bond of fellowship and charity, but not by the bond of the same faith and government." And the Anglo-Catholics are willing to trade doctrine for the visible organic unity and the episcopacy, "the government." "Lausanne marks the passing of uniformity and the coming of diversity within unity" (Ainslie).

Tolerance of error springs from indifference towards the revealed truth and indifferentism from the lack of firm convictions. Lausanne exhibited these characteristics of unionism to a marked degree. Dr. S. P. Cadman, Congregationalist, president of the Federal Council, does not believe the Congregationalist Church has the full saving truth; he denies that any Church has it. His address to the conference, published in full in the *Lutheran,* culminated in these statements: "From the first, Christian theology was treated as a vital science, in which no article was so perfect in its

primary stages that it required nothing in addition. The apostles and their successors received from our Lord the seed of faith and the nucleus of a coherent system of belief; a vital seed, a vital nucleus, to be developed, according to their potentialities, under the Holy Spirit's illumination. . . . It should lead us to those serener heights where hard and fast lines of system melt without change of creed, while spirituality and charity attain their native universality. . . . Some of these [creeds] are enriched by ageless memories of apostles and Fathers; others by the devotional enthusiasm of the Middle Ages; still others by the Reformation and Counter-Reformation movements; and not a few by the Puritanism and Evangelicalism which have played a signal part in modern churchmanship." And this view, which is shared by the *Lutheran* ("The Lutheran Church cannot in smug complacency bid the rest of the Christian believers enter its ranks. It is not likely we have all the truth that has been learned since apostolic days under the guidance of the Holy Spirit"; September 22, 1927), was shared by many at Lausanne. The *Christian Century* reports that near the close of the conference Dr. P. Ainslie brought the assembly to a high pitch of enthusiasm by declaring that for the sake of reunion he would be perfectly willing for his own denomination to go to Gethsemane just as Jesus did, and to die if need be. Unionism, having no convictions of its own, is the native foe of confessionalism, particularly of that confessionalism which springs from the divine assurance of the truth of the Scriptural teaching. Dr. Ainslie's report of the conference stigmatizes all confessionalism as denominationalism and sectarianism and declares: "All denominationalism has about it an unwholesome atmosphere, not Christian at all, but pagan. . . . It reveals how completely the Church has been ruled by the pride and opinion of men rather than by the Holy Ghost." It follows that controversy, the unmasking and denouncing of false doctrine, is barred from unionistic gatherings. And this was the key-note in Bishop Brent's opening address: "Conference is self-abasing; controversy exalts itself. Conference is a measure of peace; controversy a weapon of war. Conference looks for unities; controversy exaggerates differences." — The Roman-Catholics have naturally registered this confession of the lack of firm convictions on the part of the Lausanne Protestants with unholy glee. *America* quotes Bishop Brent: "I am in many respects as wrongly convinced on many subjects as the rest of you. . . . I will not be ashamed to acknowledge that a conviction which I now have is wrong if God tells me that it is wrong," and

says: These words "are a frank admission by Bishop Brent that he may be in error in what he believes. But this leads to a further question, Who is Bishop Brent's teacher? Is that teacher simply his own consciousness of what seems to be God's will? The representatives of hundreds of divergent sects in the United States alone find their authority in a similar claim. Assuredly, that teacher does not make for unity. Bishop Brent admits that his teacher cannot separate for him essential principle from prejudice and opinion, cannot tell him what is right and what is wrong, cannot distinguish for him what he is bound to believe on pain of his eternal salvation. . . ." Just as naturally *America* offers these faltering modern Protestants, instead of the sure, infallible testimonies of Scripture, the Roman-Catholic substitute: "The difference between Bishop Brent and the members of the conference, on one side, and Catholics, on the other, is clear. Catholics are certain that Jesus Christ left a visible Church with a visible Head, an authority to whom all must bow, a teacher that cannot err."

The unionists at Lausanne argued for their position along the old familiar lines. Dr. Tingfang Lew said: "So long as we look at the differences that separate us, we can never reach agreement; but if we look upon the needs of the entire world and look up to God, behold! our difficulties dwindle into insignificance." Other fields besides that of Foreign Missions in which the necessity of unity is felt are in rural work, to which Bishop Brent referred, and in young people's work. Miss Margaret Slattery, who comes in contact with 3,500 girls a year, said that if the Church does not unite, it will lose the young people more than ever. The stock argument of unionism, that charity demands union, was, of course, stressed. Cadman's address: ". . . while spirituality and charity attain their native universality." Ainslie's report: ". . . the badge of Christian discipleship, which is love. Long ago for love the Church substituted orthodoxy." (Ainslie does not agree with Christ. See John 8, 31.) The methods to be employed, according to the unionists, to bring about union are not the Scriptural method, the establishment of unity of the faith, but such as these: "Friendship, after all, is the highway to a united Church" (Ainslie); "a large part of time is given to devotional exercises, and it is deeply felt that unity is perhaps better prepared by common prayer than by the forging of common dogmatic formulae whose elaboration is not seldom done in a tempest of *rabies theologica*" (Dr. Keller's report, *Christian Century*), while some prefer to take the short cut described in Sherer's interview: "It seems to be their

conviction that if the churches would unite, the guidance of the Holy Spirit would enable them to adjust the relationships of Christians to one another under the new *régime* in a satisfactory manner."

Another characteristic of unionism, by the way, was evident at Lausanne. It is congenital with unionism to harp much on charity and to pronounce the most uncharitable judgment on its opponents. Dr. Cadman's address sets up that where men insist on hard and fast lines, spirituality and charity are lacking, Dr. Keller diagnoses confessionalism as *rabies theologica,* and Dr. Ainslie, who was ready to have his denomination go to Gethsemane and die, fails to crucify the uncharitable spirit which prompts him to denounce the confessionalists as claiming infallibility, to indulge in the sneer: "Long ago for love the Church substituted orthodoxy, which is very much less expensive," and to make the sweeping statements: "In this instance [Section VII] the protest came from the Anglo-Catholics. It might have come from any other; for many Christians regulate their interest in Christian unity upon whether it comes their way. . . . Would that all communions might stress penitence rather than pride!"

Whether unionism had the ascendancy at Lausanne, the official report must show. Unionism did not succeed in putting through Section VII, but the sections received bear the well-defined image and plain superscription of unionism. Section II, as already pointed out, offers a common denominator for justification by faith and salvation through works. Section III declares, for instance, that the churches possess "a fellowship . . . in all the means of grace," ignoring the radical divergence in the conception of the means of grace. Section IV shows the members of the conference uniting in common prayer. German: *"Wir haben uns zu gemeinsamem Gottesdienst zusammengefunden."* Furthermore: "Notwithstanding the differences in doctrine among us, we are united in a common Christian faith." Certainly a most candid and straightforward profession of the principle of unionism. Again: "We are united in the Christian faith which is . . . witnessed to in the Apostles' Creed." But Archbishop Soederblom, for instance, prays the Second Article differently from other Lutherans. Or, as the *Presbyterian* puts it: "We are sure that any statement acceptable to a man like Dr. Cadman would be unacceptable to us and all truly evangelical believers." Finally, "it is understood that the several churches will continue to make free use of such special confessions as they possess." In some mysterious way the Formula of

Concord and the Westminster Confession, to be used jointly in the United Church, are going to be kept from clashing. Section V: "These communions have been, in God's providence, manifestly and abundantly used by the Holy Spirit in His work of enlightening the world," etc. Surely. But not by means of their departing from Scriptural teaching, but in spite of it. "Each separate communion should gladly bring to the common life of the united Church its own spiritual treasures." Adherence to false teaching, with reference to the ministry or any other point of doctrine, never gained spiritual treasures for a communion. "In particular, we share in the conviction, repeatedly expressed in this conference, that, pending the solution of the questions of faith and order, in which agreements have not yet been reached, it is possible for us . . . to unite in the activities of brotherly service which Christ has committed to His disciples." Union without unity, expressed as baldly as possible. Section VI is a bold profession of the unionistic principle ("common appreciation of Sacraments on the part of those who may otherwise differ in conception and interpretation") and a masterpiece of unionistic equivocation ("Baptism for the remission of sins — Jesus Christ, who is our one Bread — the reality of the divine presence"). — The unionists departed from Lausanne with high hopes for the future. Dr. Ainslie opens his article on "The *Rapprochement* of the Churches" with the sentence: "The Lausanne Conference was the opening door toward wider Christian fellowship," and closes it with the wish: "If there could be a conference without officially appointed delegates and constituted of younger groups, the interpretations would go far in advance of our denominational conservatism. There is room in these times for adventurers, and the adventurers will come."

What did the Lutherans at Lausanne have to say to all this? What say the Confessions? Article VII of the Augsburg Confession: "To the true unity of the Church it is enough to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments." There must be no external union except on the basis of the unity of the faith, as the Apology says (*Trigl.*, p. 227): "Which fellowship nevertheless has outward marks, so that it can be recognized, namely, the pure doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments in accordance with the Gospel of Christ." But this "agreement in doctrine" means agreement not only in the chief articles, but "in all its articles." "We are anxious to advance that unity according to our utmost power by which nothing of the divine truth is surrendered, no room is given to the

least error." (*Trigl.*, pp. 831, 1095.) Finally: "Being instructed from the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures, we are sure concerning our doctrine and confession. . . . We also have determined not to depart even a finger's breadth from the subjects themselves, or from the phrases which are found in them" (the Confessions). (Preface. *Trigl.*, pp. 21. 23.)

Did the Lutherans at Lausanne reflect this attitude? They, with others, refused to receive at all Section VII and received the other sections only conditionally. Dr. Sherer is not in sympathy with those who "seem willing to disregard all existent confessions of faith" and is convinced that "the statements of the Church upon these (justification by faith, the universal priesthood of believers, phases of doctrine of sin and grace, particularly as to the means of grace) are as essential to the convictions of present-day believers as are those that concern the Trinity and the person and nature of Christ." Dr. Elert's conference address insisted again and again that there must be no compromising with error. And the Lutheran "Declaration" declares: "For the unity of the Church it is necessary that there be agreement in the doctrine of the Gospel and in the right administration of the Sacraments."

But these Lutheran principles were not applied by all, and by none consistently. The Lutheran Soederblom is responsible, with others, for Section VII. How could such a pronounced unionist subscribe to the statement in the "Declaration" just quoted? For the simple reason that this fine Lutheran sentence receives a most un-Lutheran interpretation in the next sentence, which reads: "To express the spiritual unity, which can indeed only be done along the lines of the ecumenical symbols, imposes a great task," etc. That means that for the purpose of agreeing with the other churches it is not necessary to come to an agreement along the lines of the Lutheran Confessions. Dr. Elert is hardly sure concerning all points of doctrine put forth in the Confessions of the Church. He said before the conference: "Perhaps former Councils of the Christian Church have erred more than once in their determination of what constituted truth and error for them. But they had faith in the truth, even though they apprehended it only in part." His further statement: "Our second wish for this council is that the great unity which it seeks may not destroy already existing unities, but that it might rather, like a mother, receive its matured and independent children into its house," reveals a unionistic animus. And why must he add to the fine declaration: "There is no confession of truth without condemnation of error" the qualifying statement: "By making this statement we are not asking for

a heresy trial"? Is the new United Church going to condemn error, but tolerate the errorist?

The Lutherans who went to Lausanne do not believe in "that unity by which nothing of the divine truth is surrendered, no room is given to the least error." The grave errors held by the liberal Lutherans did not prevent the conservative group from maintaining fraternal relations with them. However much the Lutherans disagreed among themselves, they dwelt together in peace and amity. We read in the press reports of no clash in their meetings. It does not appear that truth condemned error. The *Presbyterian* makes the point that the Lausanne Conference went after union in the wrong way, that a more reasonable path to pursue would be to discover if the various Baptist bodies can unite in one great Baptist communion, the Methodists the same, etc., and that then indeed union of the united groups might be more hopefully considered. We make the additional point that the Lausanne attempt to unite disagreeing groups was not only hopeless, but also unscriptural. And the Lutherans confirmed the conference in its position. If intradenominational unionism is to be the order of the day, interdenominational unionism will follow as a matter of course.

The position taken by the Lutherans at Lausanne was not that of Lutheran confessionalism. The Lutheran stamina was lacking. Having gone to Lausanne, they should have demanded and insisted that the conference aim at reaching agreement on the doctrines of justification by faith and of verbal inspiration and that, unless agreement on these and all other doctrines be reached, all negotiations for union must cease. And when they found that the conference, naturally, was in no mood for taking such steps, that, for instance, in spite of Dr. Elert's warning against the attempt "to find theological expressions of compromise," just such formulae were incorporated in the Report, they should have repudiated the whole proceedings as strongly as the Orthodox representatives, indeed, even more strongly. The Lutheran Declaration, if it was a protest, was an extremely weak protest. This Declaration is willing to accept the Report as matter for further discussion and, more than that, is willing, in spite of the developments at Lausanne, to have "a committee made up of Orthodox, Evangelical Lutheran, Reformed, etc., members" prepare this matter for the next conference, — is willing to work along the same lines, to keep on working together with pronounced unionists. In view of the unionistic spirit prevailing at Lausanne the Lutheran Declaration should have read: We will not go to Lausanne a second time.

E.

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

A Plea for Controversy. — The *Watchman-Examiner* in a recent issue quotes Charles Hooper, who in a letter to the *Congregationalist* makes a plea for controversy. Here are several of the sentences quoted: "To arrive at what is true and what is right can be attained only by constant interchanges of thought and opinion and by a free play of rebuttal and counter-rebuttal. . . . The Christian Church was founded and built upon controversy. . . . Truth has nothing to fear from error; but if truth never lifts her head, error will stand unabashed and unashamed."

After listening to the many ill-founded pleas "that churches should quit fighting with one another and begin to work together," it is refreshing to hear this frankly expressed desire to have controversy. Of course, it is necessary to heed what the *Formula of Concord* says on this score, namely, "that a distinction should and must by all means be observed between unnecessary and useless wrangling, on the one hand, whereby the Church ought not to be disturbed, since it destroys more than it builds up, and necessary controversy, on the other hand, as when such a controversy occurs as involves the articles of faith or the chief heads of the Christian doctrine, where for the defense of the truth the false, opposite doctrine must be reproved." (*Triglot,* p. 857.) If that kind of controversy ceases, the Christian Church is doomed to speedy decay and dissolution. MUELLER.

Luther and Missions. — Modern missionary zealots are wont to reproach Luther for his failure to mobilize the forces of the Church for the work of foreign mission. The *Western Christian Advocate* of November 17, 1927, even goes so far as to assert that "the Lutheran Reformation never really accomplished the real reformation of the Holy Catholic Church" because of this and several other alleged failures. "Luther worked out some beautiful expositions of the great commission to go into all the world, but they all pointed to the past. Nowhere does he recommend either the going out or the sending out of missionaries. For the coming of those who were not at the time serving the Christ, he depended upon the chance scattering of Christian people, as by persecution." If the statement that Luther nowhere recommends the going out of missionaries means to imply that Luther failed to set before his people the sacred duty of spreading the Gospel among all nations, the writer is not well acquainted with Luther's writings. (He gives as his source, indeed, not Luther's books, but Professor Warneck's *History of Protestant Missions.*) One quotation from Luther will suffice to dispose of the "nowhere." "It is the will of God that Christ be spread more and more. It is not enough that some few know Christ, but we should spread and proclaim it to all, so that many might come to this one assembly, yea, the whole world brought into the kingdom of Christ. . . . We are to keep going on continually and to preach, to go to those, too, unto whom Christ has not yet been preached, to teach those who have not learned

Christ, in order that they also may be brought into the spiritual kingdom of Christ." (III, 845.) In the light of this passage and similar ones Luther does not appear as looking upon the missionary duty of the Church with apathy. The statement, however, may not mean more than that Luther did not send, nor plan to send, missionaries to India, China, and other foreign countries. And that is a fact. But it is a fact that must be set down to the credit of Luther. Luther had no business to engage in a missionary campaign. The business for which God raised him up was the business of reforming the Church. Before he could aim at Christianizing the heathen, he had to Christianize apostate Christendom. It took every moment of his time, every stroke of his pen, every ounce of his strength. If God had given him the opportunity to prepare, besides the hundreds of missionaries he was instrumental in sending throughout Germany and England and France, other hundreds for India and China, never fear, his great heart would have seized the opportunity as quickly as later generations did, and, no doubt, more energetically. But the one great need was the deliverance of the Church from the rule of Antichrist. Luther would have been woefully derelict in his duty if he had not concentrated all his efforts on this one objective. *He was the Reformer.* As *Lehre und Wehre* says, 65, p. 379: "Luther would not have minded his business if he had made foreign missions his business. He was called to reform the Church. . . . Christendom as led by the papacy believed that the grace of God must be gained by man's own works; it believed exactly what the heathen and the Turk also believe. . . . The Pope would have been much pleased and probably would have subscribed quite liberally to the mission-budget if Luther had gone in for foreign missions instead of showing up Antichrist through the preaching of the Gospel and warning Christendom against him. . . . Through Luther, Christendom also was to be put in a position to bring the Gospel to the heathen." Luther did not fail in his missionary duty. But for Luther our wonderful misson-work would be a sham. — It would be well if the *Advocate* and related circles took a leaf out of Luther's book. Heathen Christians are imploring the home churches to cease sending out missionaries infected with Modernism. Unless the Gospel of Jesus Christ is preached, this missionary work is a sham. A good part of the energy of the *Advocate* should be directed towards gaining the Gospel.

E.

Unionism Truly Makes Strange Bedfellows. — A recent enthusiastic article in *Zion's Herald* of Boston, from which an excerpt is given in the September number (1927) of the *Religious Press Digest,* gives a truly amazing picture of the present situation concerning the fellowship of various faiths. The writer of the article, Charles Frederick Weller, calls July 21, 1927, a red-letter day, which will, so he says verbatim, "be remembered as beginning in Europe a spiritual movement that promises to inspire and to unite East and West, America, England, Europe, and the Orient, across the old barriers of race and creed." One is inclined to ask just why the invidious distinction is made between England and Europe, but is prevented

from doing so by the almost unbelievable narration concerning the event which took place on that day. The meeting referred to was held in the city of London, England. It is characteristic in itself that a muezzin of the London Mosque opened the meeting by a call to prayer and that the Rev. Dr. F. W. Norwood of the London City Temple closed the meeting with what people called a Christian benediction. The seven so-called faiths, or religions, of the world were presented and represented. Buddhism's message was presented by Dr. W. A. de Silva. He made a plea "for the elevation of souls by overcoming the selfish desires, which subject us to the ceaseless discord of life." The representative of "Christianity" was Dr. Sherwood Eddy, who said among other things: "When Buddha and Jesus have so long taught brotherhood, why have we achieved so little? ... This impressive assembly to-day shows that the world's great faiths can stand together. By so doing, they can save the world from war." Confucianism was represented by Dr. Wei-Chang Che'n, who sent his written message, calling attention to the ethical ideals of his religion, and stating that his belief was a mighty world influence for brotherhood and peace. Hinduism was represented by the ruler of Burdwan. Judaism had as its representative Rabbi Moses Gaster, who likewise stressed "the spirit of the one universal God and the universal brotherhood of all mankind." Mohammedanism was presented by two speakers, Abdul Majid and Maulvi A. R. Dard, the latter of whom stated that his faith includes the teachings of all religions and that the Moslems criticize no man's religion. The last speaker on the program was introduced as Dr. Annie Besant of India, England, and the world at large. She spoke in the name of Theosophy. — All of which causes a person who knows history and the Bible, even superficially, to shake his head in consternation and amazement. Query: Can the Y. M. C. A. defend the position taken by its representative?

K.

John 17, 21 Once More. — The *Gospel Trumpet,* the organ of the "Church of God," accepts the unionistic misinterpretation of John 17, 21. It says in its issue of November 10, 1927: "Read in John 17, 19—21 how Christ prayed for His people to be one. He knew it would hinder the world from believing on Him with His people divided." It is referring not simply to the offense arising from the divisions, but unfolding the thesis that Jesus is speaking of a visible union as indispensable for the conversion of men. The article states: "God wants His people to be one, so as to be able to perform the great task of saving the world. The world will listen to our message when we 'all speak the same thing.' ... To convert it is a big task. ... The power that is needed most to-day is the power that Bible unity can and will give. This will bring the much-talked-of world-wide revival, miracles of healing, and the shaking of the powers of hell and darkness. ... God can display His power only to the extent of the unity of His people." It is but fair to point out that the "Church of God," while sharing the unionistic disparagement of creeds ("All human names and creeds and traditions and dogmas of men will never enter heaven to divide and scatter God's people"), refuses to declare doc-

trine a matter of indifference: "The world will listen to our message when we 'all speak the same thing,' and this we shall all do when all of us get the right message, which is the truth and nothing but the truth." However, it identifies the revealed truth with the peculiar tenets it holds, and the union which it hopes will convert the world is the visible union of all believers in the "Church of God." "Come out of all man-made churches and abide in the one you were born into or that the Lord added you to when you were saved. You were made a member of the true Church by virtue of salvation. You became a member of the body of Christ, or the family of God, which is the Church of God." So, while the unionists look to an external union for the conversion of the world, these people expect the union in the teachings of a sect to accomplish it. These teachings include "entire sanctification, the Holy Spirit baptism, with or without speaking in tongues, one universal Church, composed of all real Christians, no formal church-joining, a Church where elders and deacons . . . pray for the healing of the sick and exercise in all the gifts of the spirit." As soon as all Christians accept this creed (it seems that the opponents of "creeds" cannot get along without creeds), the world-wide revival will set in. And all this on the basis of John 17, 21!

E.

"Offering Form. — In gratitude to God for His unspeakable Gift to this world, and especially for the fact that the light of the Gospel has reached my heart, I am enclosing herewith $..... as a thank-offering to be used as a Christmas-gift for our missionaries or to supply some special need of the work on the foreign field. Name: ——. Address: ——." This form is contained in an appeal for missionary offerings sent out by the publishing house of the General Council of the Assemblies of God. This denomination has about 50,000 members, 900 churches, and 1,200 ministers. It employed on December 1, 1925, and supported, wholly or in part, 250 missionaries, men and women, in Africa, China, India, Japan, Persia, Syria, Palestine, and other countries. We quote from the last minutes of this body: "Second: Every assembly ought to have a definite part in sending and maintaining one or more missionaries of its own or sharing the burden of one or more missionaries with one or more other assemblies."

E.

Elementary Christian Education. — Rev. J. N. Andersen of the United Norwegian Church, secretary of the Board of Elementary Christian Education, recently suggested to his synod that a conference be held in the near future, including representatives from the Board of Education, the Board of Elementary Christian Education, the Secondary Schools, Luther Theological Seminary, and the Presidents and Deans of Religion at four colleges of the Church, to discuss with him the "Relation of Education to Elementary Christian Education." In urging the matter, he prepared the following statement: "It is a trite saying that, humanly speaking, the future of the Church is dependent on elementary Christian education. But it is no less also true that higher education in the Church is dependent on the elementary. If the Christian training of the children

is neglected, they will not later want to attend Christian institutions of higher learning. And though they may be compelled to attend, they will not feel at home there nor submit to Christian discipline."

His analysis of the situation in the Synod with which he is affiliated, leads him to the following conclusions: "1) Higher education must therefore do all it can to help awaken the people within the Church to a deeper realization of the importance of elementary Christian education. In our Church, at the present time, higher education seems to be emphasized to a much greater extent than the elementary. And while we should not emphasize higher education less than we do, we must emphasize elementary Christian education a great deal more. 2) The curriculum, especially in the secondary schools, but also in our colleges, must be so arranged that the whole program of Christian education will be unified and progressive from the elementary church school on up through the academy and college. A joint committee on religious education should be appointed by the Board of Education and the Board of Elementary Christian Education to make the necessary recommendations. 3) Higher education must develop trained leadership for elementary Christian education to a much greater extent than it has done hitherto. It is not enough to have instruction in Christianity scattered through the school-years. There should be definite courses in religious education in all our secondary schools as in our colleges. — The Church is in need of trained workers, and our colleges and academies must respond to that need."

The conclusions which have been reached by the above writer confirm the opinion which has always been held in our Church with respect to Christian day-schools and encourage us to continue them. We fully agree with the view expressed that "higher education in the Church is dependent on the elementary." That claim no one can deny. MUELLER.

Bible Schools. — In one of its recent issues, the *Watchman-Examiner* says: "The value of the daily vacation Bible school has been abundantly proved. It is no longer an experiment, but an established agency of effective influence in our American cities. . . . It is encouraging to learn that this movement is becoming world-wide in its scope." We ask, Why limit the larger religious education of children to the summer months? The problem is much better solved by the week-day religious school operating throughout the school-year. FRITZ.

Parochial Schools in the Old-School Presbyterian Church 1846 to 1870. — Under this caption the *Presbyterian* of August 25 carries a remarkable article by Professor Sherrill of Louisville, Ky. The writer calls the parochial school episode in the Presbyterian Church "almost dramatic in its interest, yet forgotten now." According to him, the Old-school Presbyterian Church made the effort "to establish a great system of secular education embracing provision for education at every age level, from the youngest child up through the college, all to be entirely under the control and supervision of the Church. . . . A brave start was made all over the Assembly, and

had the movement succeeded, the Presbyterian Church would now doubtless be, as are Lutherans and Roman Catholics, nominally independent of the State in her educational system." The leaders of the Presbyterian Church in the 40's of the last century recognized the danger of an education without religion. "Alas! how many children are common-schooled out of heaven!" one of them exclaimed. The attempt was made to establish elementary schools; then, resting on them, academies and colleges. Dr. Charles Hodge of Princeton was a strong champion of this system. For almost a decade every year about a hundred elementary schools were reported as existing. Gradually they died out again. The causes for this decline mentioned by Professor Sherrill are: "The tide of conviction in American educational affairs was all in another direction; the mass of Presbyterians were in sympathy with public education under state control, although they wished to see religion taught. Here may be listed, too, the outspoken opposition that arose in some quarters of the Presbyterian Church. The matter of expense loomed large; the difficulty of securing teachers was very formidable." Strange to say, the writer says that the parochial schools did not prove satisfactory. To quote him: "The people at large had said that education may not be sectarian. The churches said education may not be wholly secular. The Presbyterian attempt showed that complete education may not be had in a system of church schools. It is for Americans yet to work out in the costly laboratory of experience a satisfactory solution of the problem. Our parochial school experiment showed one solution which is *not* satisfactory." "It is very true that many people oppose the parochial school and apply to it the ugly epithets mentioned by Professor Sherrill in another paragraph, 'sectarian,' 'divisive,' 'narrow,' 'clannish,' 'antirepublican.'" But must we be guided by the views of other people? Can what is called public opinion decide for us issues that have to do with the eternal welfare of our children? Over against the failure of the Presbyterians with respect to parochial schools we can point to heartening success in our own Church.

A Wrong Explanation. — In an editorial entitled "Always Many Divisions" the *Watchman-Examiner* endeavors to account for the existence of the many divisions within Christendom in a natural way. The writer says among other things: "Do not let us feel that the world is worse off than it ever has been before because there are so many denominations. This multiplication of denominations is unfortunate, to be sure; but, on the other hand, men feel, and have always felt, that religion is so important that a man must follow his highest convictions wherever they will lead him. . . . It is right that we should associate ourselves with those of like mind about the great fundamentals of Christianity. The fact remains, however, that some people are not gregarious. They would rather go alone than flock with others, and these men who start off on a lonely journey soon get to themselves followers, and then we have new denominations. Yes, it is unfortunate, *but perfectly natural.*"

Is this really a fair way of stating the issue? Denominations

have had their origin both in unfaithfulness and in faithfulness toward the Word of God. The Baptist denomination originated when the early Anabaptists, during Reformation days, rejected God's Word respecting the means of grace, infant baptism, the Lord's Supper, and many other doctrines which Luther proclaimed in their full purity. To-day the confessional Lutheran Church exists as an independent body because by its testimony of the truth it desires to be faithful to instructions of God's Word such as we find in Matt. 10, 23—33; 2 Cor. 6, 14—18; Rom. 16, 17, etc. MUELLER.

A Revolt against Schleiermacherism. — The system invented by Schleiermacher which makes the religious experience the source of doctrine and basis of faith holds absolute sway in modern theology. We had hardly expected the *Western Christian Advocate,* an exponent of modern, at times ultramodern, theology, to protest against this pernicious doctrine. But we are glad to note that this periodical is realizing, at least in part, what Schleiermacherism involves. An article in the issue of November 24, 1927, entitled: "The Pulpit without a Message," says: "A messenger without a message is a rebuke to his kind. Especially is this true if that messenger be a Christian minister, standing in a pulpit where God's messenger should speak forth, and with every word demonstrate that he has no commission, no direct deliverance, from the One who sends him to those who expect word from the heavenly Father. . . . If we could agree on what we believe about the Bible, within the Bible, and could consent to a common acceptance of the Bible as the Word of God, again our authority would be returned. To-day the place of authority in the Church seems not to rest on the Bible. For this reason we are raising the question repeatedly, 'Where is the place of authority?' If we had not drifted from the Bible so far, we would have it. Verily, we are at sea in our faith. The only anchorage we have upon which we are absolutely trusting to-day is 'a religious experience by faith in Jesus Christ.' Perhaps this is all that is needed, will be argued by some. We will confess it is all that is needed by those who possess it. But how was this experience obtained? By faith in the New Testament. Can we get along without an objective authority? Can we rest our faith wholly in a subjective religious experience? What are those that do not possess it going to do? The means by which the subjective evidence is obtained is through faith in the written Word. Seldom do men come to a subjective religious experience until they have first accepted the authority of the objective evidence as recorded in the New Testament. Seldom, if ever, do men come to the inner acceptance of Jesus Christ independently of faith in the Word of God. Why, then, should we not accept this as one of the essentials of our Christian faith?" The *Advocate* has not succeeded in freeing itself of *all* the shackles of Schleiermacher's delusion. It is willing to admit that the *believer* can get along with the authority of experience, and even that *some* are brought to faith independently of the Word of God. But its revolt against the experience theory is bravely begun. Its war-cry: "Can we rest our faith wholly in a subjective religious experience?" needs only the elimina-

tion of the "wholly" to give it the true Scriptural ring. On May 19, 1927, the *Advocate* was upholding Schleiermacher's theory: "Where does Christianity find its authority? To what or to whom should the Christian turn for authority? E. Stanley Jones tells us that, visiting Harnack one day, he asked this question, 'Where is the center of authority?' The great scholar answered, 'Where the Jesus of history becomes the Christ of experience. There you find your authority.' How true this is!" Let us hope that the *Advocate* will cling to its later position: "Can we get along without an objective authority?" — Nor can it retain this position if it yields verbal inspiration. Only because of its inspiration can the Bible be accepted as the Word of God and therefore as absolutely authoritative. The *Advocate* should not have published, on October 6, 1927, the contribution by Bishop Locke: "Every man will have his own Christ, and if he follows his holy ideal and conforms his life to the truths and spirit of Jesus, he will doubtless share in the salvation which Jesus brought to a dying world, even if he is not sure whether Jesus had one human parent or two or is uncertain regarding the mysteries of the atonement, or whether he thinks everything in the Holy Bible is wholly inspired."

E.

Methodist Evolutionists, Take Notice! — One of your official organs, the *Western Christian Advocate,* has come out against evolutionism. Its arguments are unanswerable. "You cannot make moral beings by an evolutionary process. . . . All the enlightenment of a universe would not exalt the intelligence of a mule, neither would it disturb the conscience of a baboon. Man progresses because he has within him the capacity for progress. Man is a subject for enlightenment because he has within him the possibility of enlightenment. Jesus was not a product of evolutionary processes." An unbridgeable gulf separates man and brute. — From the rest of the article it is not clear whether the writer is stressing the deity of Jesus Christ. Let us stress it. And the Methodist Christian who believes in the miracle of the incarnation will not balk at the miracle of creation.

E.

Rom. 16, 17 and Modern Ideas of Proselytism. — In an article which recently appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly,* as reported in the *Reader's Digest* for December, 1927, R. C. Hutchison presents some views which are in thorough accord with the very modern syncretistic ideas of our age. He says that Christianity should become more conscious of its non-proselyting objectives. And he uses strong arguments to support his views. We read, for example: "When Christ healed the lepers, He knew that they would not thank Him, much less follow Him; yet He healed them. When He taught the Beatitudes to the multitude, He knew that His hearers would not become disciples; yet He taught them." Upon such uncertain premises the author builds his appeal to ignore religious differences and to regard all men as brethren in the faith. He says: "Christianity proposes to make certain contributions to the world, and these proposals are not based in any way on proselytism. They are based simply on the words and life of Christ. To receive the direct benefits of these con-

tributions, no theological or doctrinal faith in Christ is necessary. The recipients may be Moslems, Hindus, Shintoists, or devil worshipers. Christianity proposes to make these contributions even though not a single person surrenders his indifference or deserts his own faith to become a Christian." If the man were simply speaking of the charitable duty which rests upon all Christians, this might be accepted without much hesitation, although even here we speak of the benefits derived from contact with Christianity as mere by-products of the preaching of the Gospel. But the author insists upon ignoring all doctrinal and religious differences. He states: "Christ struggled to eliminate every obstacle to direct communion and taught that *every man* — not only His disciples — had direct access to the Father in heaven, that within the chamber of each man's house was an entrance to the Holy of Holies, and that within the Holy of Holies was a God, not vengeful, but loving, tender, fatherly." If we could take away about half the New Testament, including all of the Gospel of John, there might be a show of correctness in the arguments advanced by this writer. But as it is, he is judged by just one statement of Christ, namely: "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life; no man cometh unto the Father but by Me." K.

The Work of the Baptists in Russia. — Concerning the new evangelical movement in Russia the *Presbyterian* writes: "Alongside the gracious news from different missionary centers in China of that moving of the Spirit as the wind that crosses the fields of grain, bending the harvest before its gentle breeze, there comes also a report of an even more radical move among the Russians, that is vigorous and forceful and yet so clearly a new reformation within the borders of the great Soviet lands. In Siberia it is stated that in one country there were 3,000 baptized in one day. The report indicates that these leaders are largely Baptists; for during all these later years the Baptists have been the foremost evangelists in Russia and seem specially fitted to work with the Slav races. Both believe in immersion as the mode of baptism, and the deep religious nature of the Russian is peculiarly moved by the definite teaching of the necessity of the clear knowledge of an indwelling Christ. Through this revival there has sprung up along the Siberian railway the surprising number of 1,500 churches. Many Mohammedans and Tartars are among the converts. It is reported that the Greek Catholic priests are not at all opposed to the movement, but that some are in deep sympathy with it. Revivals come when the storms are most severe." MUELLER.

Young People and the Christian Home. — Concerning the present-day situation among young people with regard to their interest in religion, Dr. J. W. Stevenson, an Englishman now residing in Quebec, says: "In Canada the young people's problem is causing grave concern. While we are managing to hold many of them in the Church, the great majority are not interested in the Church and, judging from their lives, are not much concerned with religion. There is undoubtedly a good deal of genuinely Christian activity in our country that is showing itself in various service clubs and other organizations. While I believe the inspiration of these activities is

Christian, yet the claims of Christianity are seldom given any prominence by those engaged in such work. If we can *train the children in service,* we shall have done much to ensure a vigorous Church for the future. But without the cooperation of the home our work cannot become very effective. To make the home Christian is no less the duty of the Church than to train the child in Christian ways of living."

Our Church has long ago seen the necessity of training the children and for this purpose has established Christian schools. The result has been not only that the children themselves have been reared in the fear and admonition of the Lord, but that in many cases also the home was drawn nearer to Christ. MUELLER.

A Sample of Modern Wisdom. — Dr. Knight Dunlap holds the chair of psychology at Johns Hopkins University. He recently wrote an article for the *Journal of General Psychology,* in which he offers conclusions which almost cause a person to despair of any results of modern science. Speaking of the reason why human beings wear clothes, he states that there have been four theories of the origin of clothing. These are: First, the modesty theory (covering up the body); secondly, the immodesty theory (making the body mysterious and alluring); thirdly, the adornment theory; and fourthly, the utility or protection theory. The last form is that which would account for hanging strings, leaves, strips of hide, the tails of animals, and similar articles so that they will flap with the movements of the wearer. In other words, this theory, which Professor Dunlap has accepted, would simply mean that people put on clothes as we place mosquito bars over horses, or as horses use their manes and their tails to drive away annoying insects. One of the last conclusions in this strange article is given as follows: "Clothing itself is not modest or immodest. Any degree of clothing, including complete nudity, is perfectly modest as soon as we become thoroughly accustomed to it." To such degrees of babbling will men descend if they set aside the truth of Scriptures. Gen. 3 gives the reason why men wear clothes, and two hours spent in observing and thinking will enable any person with common sense to answer arguments such as those advanced by this "psychologist." The fact that people become callous to indecent exposure has no more strength of argument than the fact that some criminals regard their work as a noble craft and even have their patron saints. K.

Difficulties Connected with the Translation of the Bible into the Tongue of Primitive Peoples. — In a pamphlet issued by the American Bible Society the following interesting account is given of the difficulties which confronted the missionaries translating the Scriptures for an African people: —

"The Bulus had no word for *God.* They had a word *Zambe,* signifying an immortal spirit that created man and the gorilla, then went far off and left them to shift for themselves. So this name was used for *God* in the translation. The wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, truth, and mercy of the Supreme Being as revealed in the Bible gave to *Zambe* a new and larger personality,

'and the Bulu soon came to recognize and appropriate a new spiritual entity under the old name.' Thus was the four-inch pipe enlarged to take the full stream of the Word.

"Since the Bulus had no equivalent for *saints,* the translators simply said *bot ya Zambe,* people of God, and these common words began to acquire an enlarged meaning.

"They had no term for *conscience.* They did have a quaint expression, *mone mot ya nlem,* 'little man of the heart.' So these pointed words are used in the Bible translation, and the Bible gives the little man of the heart an authority over daily conduct that he never before possessed.

"Think of the difficulties of translation when the native language contains no word for *book,* no word for *bread,* none for *church,* or *wolf* or *moth,* since these things themselves are unknown. The words, 'Their hearts are as wolves' would mean nothing to the Bulu, but he immediately understands when you say, 'Their hearts are as leopards.' He is not troubled by moths, and it would be beside the point to warn him not to lay up treasures where moth and rust corrupt. But the *bibiam,* hard little insects equipped with tweezers, do destroy his property, and the lesson immediately goes home when it reads, 'Do not lay away goods where bibiam and rust eat.' Thus extreme literalness, while strictly adhered to in most cases, must sometimes be sacrificed in the interest of fidelity to the real significance of the text.

"A curious example of how misleading a literal translation can be occurs with reference to the word *serpent.* 'When a son asks for a fish, will his father give him a serpent?' inquires Jesus. Our mental answer is a horrified *No!* The translators knew, however, that the Bulus eat snakes and regard them as a great delicacy. 'A Bulu boy,' says Dr. Fraser, 'would be more pleased at receiving a snake from his father than at receiving a fish; for thus he would not be bothered by bones and scales, would get more meat from a snake than from a fish of the same size, and would enjoy the meat and skin fully as well as those of a fish. The point and force of the illustration obviously require that the earthly father shall be represented as giving his son something good — not only good, but better than some other thing which he avoids giving, else God's willingness to give the Holy Spirit to those who ask would not be set forth. A fish, as we have seen, is not better than a snake to the Bulu; but it is better than a centipede. Accordingly, *nsanelete,* 'centipede,' instead of *nyo,* 'serpent,' is used in the translated text, and the Bulu at once understands, reading or hearing thus, that as a father gives his loved son a fish, not a centipede, so, and much more than so, God is willing to give His Holy Spirit to those who ask."

"These few examples may slightly suggest the immense labor that is necessary — wise, patient, loving labor — before millions of homes are opened to the Bible."

A "Vulgar" Hymn. — William Henry Cardinal O'Connell, Archbishop of Boston, recently gave decisive publication to his wrath against certain English hymns which Roman Catholics have unwarily

allowed into their funeral services. *Time* reports this as follows: "The specific hymn which His Eminence denounced was 'Beautiful Isle of Somewhere.' It goes: —

"Somewhere the sun is shining,
Somewhere the song-birds dwell;
Hush, then, thy sad repining;
God lives, and all is well.
Somewhere, somewhere,
Beautiful Isle of Somewhere!
Land of the true, where we live anew,
Beautiful Isle of Somewhere!

"Of 'Beautiful Isle of Somewhere' Cardinal O'Connell commanded last week: 'I have noticed lately that on several occasions, at the funerals held in our churches, vulgar and profane English hymns, composed evidently by people who have no faith, but plenty of maudlin sentiment, have been sung at the end of the ritual. One of these hymns, 'Beautiful Isle of Somewhere,' a flagrant outrage to faith and the ritual, seems to be the favorite sob-producer. The Catholic ritual is so noble, so sublime, and so divine that only a vulgar mind could be guilty of insulting it with such trash. I call this to the attention of the pastors and the people of the archdiocese in order that this revolting experience will not be repeated. Any organist or choir director allowing such a stupid performance in the future will be immediately suspended or discharged."

Regarding the origin of the hymn *Time* enlightens its readers thus: "Everybody knows the melody. Jessie Brown Pounds and John S. Pearis composed it in 1897, when Cardinal O'Connell was in Rome, domestic prelate to Pope Leo XIII. Voices welling with young love sang it from stoops to hollyhocks and sunflowers nodding in moonlight; voices welling with grief sang it at funeral services. It still draws applause at burlesque shows, and it still can soften the memory of clods plumping down on coffins. It is an accepted hymn in many a Christian church."

No doubt, Cardinal O'Connell is right in denouncing "Beautiful Isle of Somewhere." It is not a hymn that should be sung in a Christian service. It contains no Christian theology, no comfort, no hope, no thought of the Cross of Christ. Its mushy sentiment is indeed "a flagrant outrage to faith," that is, Christian faith. But so is also the Romish ritual, which outrages the *sola gratia!*

MUELLER.

Ape-Bones and the Cradle of Civilization. — The *Western Christian Advocate* of September 22 tells of the sad case of an archeologist who, from studying the customs, the religion, etc., of the Maya Indians, is personally convinced that Yucatan is the real cradle of mankind, but is prevented from absolutely establishing his theory by the absence of an all-important factor. This archeologist declares: "If we could accurately trace the record of the Mayan civilization, we might be able to prove that the so-called 'new world' is the cradle of civili-

zation. There are to-day evidences of agricultural knowledge and the existence of highly developed food plants in that territory which date back thousands of years. The only difficulty in the way of a general acceptance of the theory that America is the original seat of mankind is the absence of apes, or the bones of apes, in South America. If the bones of anthropoid apes can be discovered, then the last obstacle to the acceptance of this theory is removed." All good and true evolutionists ought to come to the assistance of this patient investigator. They might advise him to go on and discover these missing bones. That should be easy as the discovery of the *pithecanthropus erectus* proved to be. Or they could advise him to locate that famous island which harbored the apelike ancestor of man and was unaccountably submerged, along the coast of South America. The rest of us would in the mean while point out to him that the difficulty he is finding does not really exist. What was to prevent these beings, after their transformation into men, from leaving the bones of their ancestors in Java and migrating to Yucatan? The distance is exactly the same as their children would have had to cover to go, according to this theory, from Yucatan to Asia, etc. — The comment of the *Advocate* is this: "If a man continues to make his investigations with preconceived ideas, it will take him a long time to find the real truth." — Or can it be that this archeologist is only poking fun at his fellow-scientists? E.

BOOK REVIEW.

Manual for Concordia Edition Bobbs-Merrill Second Reader. By *Baker and Baker.* 115 pages; 25 cts., net. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

Manual for Concordia Edition Bobbs-Merrill Third Reader. By *Baker and Baker.* 111 pages; 25 cts., net. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

These manuals are gotten out for teachers, in order that the system of Bobbs-Merrill Readers, Concordia Edition, may be used to the greatest advantage. In the manual for the Third Reader it is stated: "The lessons outlined in the manual should aid the teacher so to present each selection and to guide the study period that reading is always for the child a 'purposeful activity.' The importance of silent reading is recognized, and varied types of silent reading lessons are provided, as well as devices for motivating oral reading. Suggestions are given in the introduction for supplementary silent reading upon the pupil's initiative, and for oral reading with real audience situations. A list of suitable books for the third-grade library shelf is included. The value of diagnostic tests in improving the quality of teaching is explained, and information is given both concerning standardized tests and informal tests based on Third Reader stories. Definite help is given in interpreting such tests to gain improved results."

FRITZ.

Hymn Interludes. By *Herman Grote.* 258 pages; $3.00, net. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

This new book provides interludes for hymns found in our English hymnal. It is not necessary or even desirable that interludes be played after every stanza, but some interludes there ought to be. Organists should use the interludes provided in this book rather than attempt to make unsuitable ones of their own. FRITZ.

The Pride of Graystone. By *G. L. Wind.* 373 pages; $1.50. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

Children and young people will read, and they ought to read. Many of them like to read stories. This new story by Mr. Wind can safely be placed in their hands. It may well serve to counteract some of the wrong ideas concerning Christianity which are current in popular magazines. FRITZ.

Christianity and Common Sense. By *Rev. Clarence E. Macartney, D. D.* 303 pages, 5×7½. $2.00. (John C. Winston Co., Philadelphia.)

The author is pastor of a Presbyterian church in Pittsburgh and at one time was Moderator (President) of the Northern Presbyterians. Dr. Macartney, while Reformed in his theology, is a man who honors his God and Savior and magnifies His holy Word. In this book he deals, from the conservative Reformed viewpoint, with the doctrines of Christianity. The form of discourse used in the book is that of the dialog between a "celestial," or a being from another world, and a "mortal," or a man from this world. This artifice, as well as the writer's gift of striking expression, makes *Christianity and Common Sense* a notable contribution to the modern restatement of Protestant doctrine. GRAEBNER.

The Crisis in American Lutheran Theology. By *Vergilius Ferm, M. A., Ph. D.* 409 pages, 5¼×8. $3.00. (The Century Co., New York.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

The author of this book, Vergilius Ferm, is assistant professor of philosophy in the college of Wooster (Ohio) and member of the Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod. His book is an enlargement of his Ph. D. thesis at Yale Divinity School.

The publishers give the following brief *résumé* of the contents: "A historical study of the Lutheran Church in America from its establishment by the patriarch Muhlenberg in 1742 from loosely organized units, to the doctrinal basis of the body known as the United Lutheran Church of America. It covers the launching of the movement in 1818 for a more intimate union of the synods and the threatened disruption of the same, the advent of Schmucker, who led and molded the character of the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in America. The era of hard feeling, discords, and divisions and the gradual downfall of Schmucker. The final victory of conservative Lutheranism and the death throes of American Lutheranism in the *débris* of outworn and outgrown vestures of an earlier day."

We have read the volume with keen interest. It is a remarkably clear and fairly unprejudiced presentation of one of the most interesting periods in the history of the Lutheran Church in America. The author has quoted

extensively from the original sources and has thus greatly enhanced the value of his treatise. We should have welcomed some fuller details as to the influence of the conservative Lutherans of the West on the change to the more conservative stand of the Eastern synods which organized the General Council; for the position of "Ohio," "Iowa," and "Missouri" undoubtedly had a bearing on the situation that brought on the breach in the ranks of the General Synod. But this may not have been possible within the limits that the author had set for himself.

Strange to say, the closing sentences in the foreword and in the body of the book raised questions in our minds. The foreword, written by Luther A. Weigle of Yale University, concludes with these words: "Judgments of Dr. Schmucker will differ, as they always have. I am inclined to think, however, that his figure will loom greater, rather than less, as the passage of years lends perspective to the view of American church history and as we draw nearer to the realization of his dream of Christian union." If Dr. Weigle means by this that Christian union will be advanced by a return to the theological standards of S. S. Schmucker and the rejection of all that is distinctively Lutheran, then we must emphatically disagree! Dr. Ferm concludes his discussion with a short closing paragraph that leaves one uncertain as to his exact meaning. He writes: "Conservative Lutheranism had won, and American Lutheranism was buried in the *débris* of outworn and outgrown vestures of an earlier day." That sentence may be variously construed. We wonder what the author means!

The book is supplied with several valuable appendices, a complete bibliography of primary and secondary sources, and an index. Appendix B, which presents, in parallel columns, the Augustana of 1530 and the "American Recension of 1855" is particularly interesting. Our pastors, teachers, and also our intelligent laymen will find this book a valuable addition to their libraries. The fact that a company such as the Century Co. saw its way clear to publish this book is, to say the least, significant. W. G. P.

Misconceptions of the Word and Work of the Holy Spirit. By *J. N. Kildahl.* Translated from the Norwegian by *A. Sophie Boe.* 63 pages, 5×8. (Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn.)

Also in its English translation the late Dr. J. N. Kildahl's discussion of conversion contains the strange anomalies which we noted years ago in the Norwegian original. Not once, but ten times and a hundred times, Kildahl emphasizes God's monergism; God alone converts the heart, man can do nothing; he does less than nothing, he resists. All is the Spirit's work, even "that the sinner has begun to think seriously about his relation to God" (p. 39). There is nothing in man capable of improvement. "Before faith comes, there is nothing which the Gospel can take hold of and begin to improve; for the Old Adam cannot be improved" (p. 36). There is no intermediate state (p. 9). Yet Kildahl describes persons who are "spiritually awakened," who "long to be converted" (p. 10), "earnestly desire to be converted" (p. 29), yet "resisting the Gospel's free offer" (p. 33), hence evidently are not yet converted. Those who are disturbed in their minds regarding their soul's salvation are comforted by the author with copious references to the redemptive work of Christ and the universal character of the Gospel promise. But why does he not tell those who are "spiritually

awakened" who "long to be converted," that the great work of the Spirit, the turning from sin to God, has by this very awakening already been accomplished? — that they are in fact converted? Kildahl does not want an intermediate state; yet what other term can be applied to those who have already learned to hate sin, but are not yet converted? GRAEBNER.

Paul. A study in social and religious history. By *Adolph Deissmann.* Translated by *Wm. E. Wilson, B. D.* Second edition. Price, $5.00. (Geo. H. Doran Co.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

The books of Dr. Deissmann exhibit deep learning and rare literary brilliancy. In him we are dealing with a scholar, whom the ardent pursuit of technical studies has not turned into a dry-as-dust, tedious specialist. This work on Paul is written with all the dash and elegance which we are accustomed to see in Deissmann's books. In the translation the excellencies of the original are still to be felt and enjoyed. The translator did his work well; according to my observation but few lapses can be checked up against him. What is to be said of the contents of this work? The student and pastor will here receive much valuable information on the life and the writings of Paul. The chapters on "The World of Paul," "Paul the Man," "Paul the Jew," are not only extraordinarily interesting, but illuminating as well. Many a statement in Paul's letters is cleared up or made more significant by a brief remark. In discussing Paul's theology (a term, by the way, which Deissmann eschews, though quite unnecessarily), the author shows remarkable insight when he points to the two kinds of religion which have been taught and still exist beside each other in the world. He says, p. 118: "These two types of cult behind which the battle of shadowy giants, champions in the hoary strife between works and faith, between man's will and God's grace, is fought out, were grasped with admirable clearness in the Augsburg Confession when it contrasted the cult of Law and the cult of the Gospel and perceived the cult of the Gospel to be a reaction." (Deissmann uses the term reaction as meaning an action in response, God Himself being the one who acts and the congregation simply saying Amen.) He then quotes Article III of the Augsburg Confession. Needless to say, he describes Paul as having preached the doctrine taught in this article of the Augustana. This is certainly valuable testimony to the Scripturalness of the chief element in our foremost confessional writing. While thus much can be said in praise of this work, it has also serious defects. Deissmann is altogether a modern theologian. Whether Jesus really appeared to His disciples, the author will not dare to say. Sufficient for him that they *believed* they had seen Jesus. The same is true with respect to the vision of the heavenly Jesus on the part of Paul. That Paul saw and heard Jesus, Deissmann will not assert. What Paul believed concerning the great event before Damascus, that he wishes to determine. Paul's view of the universe is said to have been the "naive" and erroneous one held by his contemporaries. The apostle's use of allegorical exegesis is said to have led him to do great violence to the text in his interpretation, purported examples of which the author then proceeds to submit (p. 102). It will be seen, then, that whoever wishes to use this work has to be careful and must be able to distinguish between truth and error.

Comrades of the Carpenter. By *A. Z. Conrad, D. D.*, Pastor of Park St. Congregational Church, Boston. 186 pages. $1.50. (Fleming H. Revell Company, New York.)

This volume was sent to the reviewer autographed and with a reference to 2 Cor. 9, 8: "And God is able to make all grace abound toward you; that ye, always having all sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work." This beautiful passage, no doubt, prompted the writing of the book. Yet the writer's method is not that of Paul. The very title is misleading and defeats the purpose which he may have had in view. Those who accept Christ merely as the "carpenter" will certainly not read this book, which recognizes Christ's deity and atoning love. Those to whom Christ is more than a "carpenter" will be offended by the lowering of the Christ ideal, which the evangelists and apostles depict so sublimely in their writings. A true Christian will follow Christ and in Him "abound to every good work"; but not because Christ was a "carpenter," — as such His life and teaching might not have been above criticism, — but because the divine-human Christ, God's own Son, is his personal Savior, in whom, through faith, he has become a new creature, created unto good works. Christ can rightly be presented as a teacher and example only after He has been preached as the divine Redeemer, who has ransomed and redeemed sinners from everlasting damnation. This the author fails to do. MUELLER.

The Christ and the Creed. By *Warren Akin Candler, D. D., LL. D.* 134 pages; $1.25. (Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn.)

These lectures by a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, take the right side in the creedal controversy raging at the present time. They give a lucid and forceful exposition of the nature and necessity of creeds, particularly the ecumenical creeds, and of the nature and source of the wide-spread antipathy to creeds: "It does not proceed from the persuasion of inaccuracy in the formulation of truth, but from the disbelief of the existence and certainty of any formal and abiding expression of truth itself." Our author takes the Scriptural position on the doctrine of Christ, which "is the heart of the Creed," and shows that the modernistic denial of the Incarnation, Virgin Birth, Resurrection, etc., confessed in the Creed is a denial of fundamental truths, of Scripture. He discusses the "*ignis fatuus* view of 'doctrinal development,' of 'the symbolic interpretation,' and of the theory which claims to derive Christian truth from experience, and makes experience a test of doctrine and the criterion by which to determine the nature of revealed facts." He points out the shallowness of the slogan, "Christianity is a life and not a creed," and points to the queer fact that the creeds of the anticreedal parties, "of rationalism and unbelief, are far more numerous and divergent than all the creeds of all the churches." He refuses to have creeds and deeds put into opposition: "The truth of the Christian Creed and the truth of Christian ethics is one and indivisible. An attack upon one is an assault upon the other. — The Modernist theory of knowledge is obviously antagonistic to any stable system of morality. . . . The creedless preacher now most logically becomes a codeless moralist." In several particulars we cannot agree with the author, as when he, with his Church, deletes the "descended into hell" from the Apostles' Creed, when he states that "the religion of Christ makes its

appeal to reason and demands only that reason be exercised reasonably," "that heresies of conduct are doubtless worse than heresies of creed," and that "the Sermon on the Mount is the *Magna Charta* of the kingdom of heaven." How much more effective the testimony of the Fundamentalists would be if they would cast such grave errors overboard, if this whole treatise, as most of it is, were in line with this paragraph: "The hope of the world is not in the fickle and fanciful teachings of Liberalism, but in the factual Creed of the Christ and the historic Christ of the Creed; for 'in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily'; and in Him 'are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.' 'Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.'" E.

Christian Ethics. The George Dana Boardman Lectures, 1927. (University of Pennsylvania Press.)

Should state universities offer courses in Christian ethics? And is there a need for Lutheran universities? State-controlled universities are estopped from teaching Christian ethics. The teaching of Christian ethics must be based on the doctrines of justification by faith and of the vicarious satisfaction of Jesus. Such teaching, however, would be classified as sectarian, and the University of Pennsylvania will have none of it. The authorities in charge of this course characterize it thus: "Jesus of Nazareth is the supreme ethical Authority. When we come to receive from Him our final awards, He will not ask, 'What was your theory of atoms? What was your doctrine of atonement?' . . . but He will ask, 'What did you do with Me? Did you accept Me as your personal standard of character? Were you a practical every-day Christian?' Christian ethics will be the judgment test." And the lecturers carried out this program faithfully. The Unitarian, Jewish, and upright-heathen citizens of Pennsylvania have no reason to apply for an injunction on the basis of this course. The first lecture was delivered by a Unitarian minister. "When a sinner is brought before Jesus, he is not to be condemned, but rather to be rescued and restored. And this He sought to accomplish by awakening unused capacities. He desired the best in them. . . . This is the message of Jesus to the world." A school superintendent gave the second lecture. "From the earliest time when men first began to live together in groups, they found it necessary for the welfare of the group to agree upon certain principles of human relations and to require conformity to those principles. . . . Even orthodox Jews, who deny the divinity of Christ, find it possible to accept His ethical principles. . . . A belief in God is essential to a complete life." The third lecturer, a Roman Catholic priest, indeed speaks of the necessity of "preaching Christ and Christ crucified," but is at bottom agreed with his Unitarian colleague. Embracing the Gospel means "the subjection of the lower animal nature to a higher law of the spirit." "To husband and wife, guarded and strengthened by the heavenly grace which His merits gained for them, He gave the power to attain holiness in the married state." "Parents and children, impelled by nature and blessed by God, lovingly strove to make their little domicile a paradise on earth." The best the next lecturer, an Episcopalian professor of systematic divinity, can do for Christ is to declare: "He did not merely summon men to an attachment

to moral ideas, but attachment to a moral Person." And the statement that "the Christian religion is the revelation of God as Father" is meant in the Ritschlian sense: the atonement is not needed to enable men to say, "Our Father." The last lecture, by a Congregationalist doctor of divinity, refers to Christ one single time, and in this wise: "Jesus, the Son of Man, the great Friend of all the sons of men, however you may define His person and whatever your theological point of view may be, chose that way that is steep and narrow and rocky and darkened and shadowed here and there. He lived by the slogan, 'I must.'" — Most certainly Jesus is the great Teacher of ethics, and those portions of the lectures which deal with the ethical teachings of the Bible impress important truths, often in a striking way. But the fine structure has no foundation; it is not built on 1 John 4 10. 11 and Rom. 6, 14; it must bury its builders under its ruins. — "I myself have heard a great preacher who did not mention Christ and the Gospel and preached the ethics of Aristotle. Is this not a childish, foolish way to preach to Christians?" (*Triglot*, p. 123.) These lectures, however, were delivered at a state university and were addressed, we surmise, to Aristotelian Christians. State universities cannot teach Christian ethics. And a Lutheran university is a good thing. E.

What Think Ye of Christ? And Other Sermons. By *J. H. O. Smith.* 298 pages, 5¼×7¾. $1.75. (The Standard Publishing Company, Cincinnati, O.)

The author of this book, Dr. J. H. O. Smith, is introduced by Virgil Wilfred Wallace, in an introduction written by him, as "a man rarely gifted, who has towered for many years a prince among his peers of the American pulpit." The reading of this introduction produces great expectations; but great is the disappointment when the sermons are read. True, Dr. Smith stands for the fundamentals of Christianity; this much is in his favor in these days of rationalistic Modernism. His sermons, however, are not models of good sermonizing, neither as to homiletical construction nor as to contents. After all, the great truths of the Bible are not fully and clearly presented. We should not advise our preachers, especially our young men in the ministry, to purchase such sermon books. The preachers of our day need no encouragement in the direction of shallow preaching, but rather in the direction of good, sound doctrinal preaching applied to the spiritual needs of men. — The last sermon in Dr. Smith's book is a sermon on "Mary, the Mother of the Messiah," by *Mrs.* J. H. O. Smith.

FRITZ.

From Pillar to Post. By *Martha Wylie.* 203 pages. $2.00. (The John C. Winston Company, Chicago.)

This is a story of love and romance centered around two characters, Elizabeth Wilston, church-worker, and John Webster, missionary in China. After numerous troubles, in the course of which Elizabeth is married to an unworthy man, of whom she is later freed by his death, the story ends in the calm evening of a happy marriage. The story is written to supply the Christian reading public with wholesome literature, and while it is not entirely void of objectionable features, it may safely be placed in the hands of our youth. The price is rather high considering the mechanical make-up of the book. MUELLER.